

"There can be no institution designed to co-operate with the judicial powers in the detection and punishment of crimes more perfect than that of Grand Jurors. It is one of their most important duties, however, to protect the innocent against the groundless and malicious accusations which are so frequent in a Government where any person may obtain and pursue a public prosecution at the expense of the State."

"It was formerly held that the Grand Jury ought to find a bill if probable evidence were adduced to support it, because it is only an accusation; and the prisoner can defend himself on his trial. But this is an oppressive and dangerous position; and has since been denied and almost unrepented by the greatest sages of the law, who have deprecated the ignominy, dangers of perjury, the anxiety of delay, and the misery of a prisoner, that might be the consequence of an accusation that does not fully satisfy the Grand Jury of the guilt of the defendant. Accordingly, it has now become a settled principle that the Grand Jury cannot, consistently with their oath, find a bill except on such testimony as would justify them as a traverse jury, to find the prisoner guilty. The reason of that principle of the law of evidence, that if a jury of trials entertain a doubt of the guilt of the party accused they ought to acquit him, is equally applicable to a Grand Jury."

We commend the above extracts from a "Treatise upon the Office and Duty of Grand Jurors," by Daniel Davis, Solicitor General of Massachusetts, to all persons who may think that Grand Jurors are registering machines to record the will of a Judge and Solicitor. We do not suppose any one will question the authority of this writer. Lawyers who know the weight to which his opinions are entitled will not do so. Those who never heard of him, and some of our legal luminaries, who greatly fear, never did hear of him, will keep quiet to hide their ignorance, if for no other reason.

Grand Jurors—Their Rights and Their Duties.
The great importance of this question has assumed in the estimation of the people of the Cape Fear, by reason of recent occurrences, renders unnecessary any apology for our frequent reference to the subject. A free press, free speech and free jury are as indispensable to the liberties of the people of the Cape Fear to-day, as they were a hundred years ago. Our ancestors knew their value then. If their descendants do not know their value now, it is not for the want of the teaching of history or for the lack of personal experience.

One hundred years ago the Lord Chief Justice of England sought to enforce the doctrine that Judge Russell seeks to fasten upon the country to-day. The same question that to-day comes to the lips of every thinking man was then asked, and with overwhelming forces. The great JUSTICE then asked: "Why force twelve honest men in palpable violation of their oaths, to pronounce their fellow subject a guilty man, when, almost at the same moment, they forbid them inquiring into the only circumstance which, in the eye of the law and reason, constitutes guilt, the malignity an innocence of his intentions?"

There was danger then; there is danger now. This is no new question, nor does it even come in a new form. We verily believe that in the shape of race and oppression, at least, there is nothing new under the sun. The same authority, from which we quoted on yesterday, says: "It is asserted in this note quoted in Bacon, that it is the doctrine of Lord Hale confirmed by *Pemberton, C. J.*, in the trial of Lord Shaftesbury, that as an indictment is merely an accusation and the party is afterwards to undergo a trial, the Grand Jury ought, UPON PROBABLE EVIDENCE ONLY, to find a bill. This doctrine is wholly inadmissible in any government when the protection of the innocent and the rights of the accused are among the first objects of the constitution and laws."

That bill? The Journal still lives! They rest from their labor. Judge Russell and Mr. Solicitor Cantwell have been in the pangs of a protracted labor during the past week, and, strange to say, for two such old ones, they have made a miscount that would reflect upon the accuracy of even the youngest political matron in the land. Keeping accounts is evidently not a specialty with those gentlemen. But the miscount in time was perhaps their most venial error. There was a sad mistake, too, somehow, in establishing the paternity of their expected offspring, which, taking time by the forelock, they had already named "Libel."

They tried to father the "Libel responsibility" on the Journal, but the trouble was to prove it. It was a serious thing. It was said that the Journal had pronounced one Hugh L. Bond, Judge of the United States Circuit Court, to be a

LOCAL.

THE WILMINGTON JOURNAL.
WILMINGTON, N. C.,
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1872.

GRAND JURIES—THEIR RIGHTS AND DUTIES.
There can be no institution designed to co-operate with the judicial powers in the detection and punishment of crimes more perfect than that of Grand Jurors. It is one of their most important duties, however, to protect the innocent against the groundless and malicious accusations which are so frequent in a Government where any person may obtain and pursue a public prosecution at the expense of the State.

"It was formerly held that the Grand Jury ought to find a bill if probable evidence were adduced to support it, because it is only an accusation; and the prisoner can defend himself on his trial. But this is an oppressive and dangerous position; and has since been denied and almost unrepented by the greatest sages of the law, who have deprecated the ignominy, dangers of perjury, the anxiety of delay, and the misery of a prisoner, that might be the consequence of an accusation that does not fully satisfy the Grand Jury of the guilt of the defendant. Accordingly, it has now become a settled principle that the Grand Jury cannot, consistently with their oath, find a bill except on such testimony as would justify them as a traverse jury, to find the prisoner guilty. The reason of that principle of the law of evidence, that if a jury of trials entertain a doubt of the guilt of the party accused they ought to acquit him, is equally applicable to a Grand Jury."

We commend the above extracts from a "Treatise upon the Office and Duty of Grand Jurors," by Daniel Davis, Solicitor General of Massachusetts, to all persons who may think that Grand Jurors are registering machines to record the will of a Judge and Solicitor. We do not suppose any one will question the authority of this writer. Lawyers who know the weight to which his opinions are entitled will not do so. Those who never heard of him, and some of our legal luminaries, who greatly fear, never did hear of him, will keep quiet to hide their ignorance, if for no other reason.

Grand Jurors—Their Rights and Their Duties.
The great importance of this question has assumed in the estimation of the people of the Cape Fear, by reason of recent occurrences, renders unnecessary any apology for our frequent reference to the subject. A free press, free speech and free jury are as indispensable to the liberties of the people of the Cape Fear to-day, as they were a hundred years ago. Our ancestors knew their value then. If their descendants do not know their value now, it is not for the want of the teaching of history or for the lack of personal experience.

One hundred years ago the Lord Chief Justice of England sought to enforce the doctrine that Judge Russell seeks to fasten upon the country to-day. The same question that to-day comes to the lips of every thinking man was then asked, and with overwhelming forces. The great JUSTICE then asked: "Why force twelve honest men in palpable violation of their oaths, to pronounce their fellow subject a guilty man, when, almost at the same moment, they forbid them inquiring into the only circumstance which, in the eye of the law and reason, constitutes guilt, the malignity an innocence of his intentions?"

There was danger then; there is danger now. This is no new question, nor does it even come in a new form. We verily believe that in the shape of race and oppression, at least, there is nothing new under the sun. The same authority, from which we quoted on yesterday, says: "It is asserted in this note quoted in Bacon, that it is the doctrine of Lord Hale confirmed by *Pemberton, C. J.*, in the trial of Lord Shaftesbury, that as an indictment is merely an accusation and the party is afterwards to undergo a trial, the Grand Jury ought, UPON PROBABLE EVIDENCE ONLY, to find a bill. This doctrine is wholly inadmissible in any government when the protection of the innocent and the rights of the accused are among the first objects of the constitution and laws."

That bill? The Journal still lives! They rest from their labor. Judge Russell and Mr. Solicitor Cantwell have been in the pangs of a protracted labor during the past week, and, strange to say, for two such old ones, they have made a miscount that would reflect upon the accuracy of even the youngest political matron in the land. Keeping accounts is evidently not a specialty with those gentlemen. But the miscount in time was perhaps their most venial error. There was a sad mistake, too, somehow, in establishing the paternity of their expected offspring, which, taking time by the forelock, they had already named "Libel."

They tried to father the "Libel responsibility" on the Journal, but the trouble was to prove it. It was a serious thing. It was said that the Journal had pronounced one Hugh L. Bond, Judge of the United States Circuit Court, to be a

LOCAL.

THE WILMINGTON JOURNAL.
WILMINGTON, N. C.,
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1872.

GRAND JURIES—THEIR RIGHTS AND DUTIES.
There can be no institution designed to co-operate with the judicial powers in the detection and punishment of crimes more perfect than that of Grand Jurors. It is one of their most important duties, however, to protect the innocent against the groundless and malicious accusations which are so frequent in a Government where any person may obtain and pursue a public prosecution at the expense of the State.

"It was formerly held that the Grand Jury ought to find a bill if probable evidence were adduced to support it, because it is only an accusation; and the prisoner can defend himself on his trial. But this is an oppressive and dangerous position; and has since been denied and almost unrepented by the greatest sages of the law, who have deprecated the ignominy, dangers of perjury, the anxiety of delay, and the misery of a prisoner, that might be the consequence of an accusation that does not fully satisfy the Grand Jury of the guilt of the defendant. Accordingly, it has now become a settled principle that the Grand Jury cannot, consistently with their oath, find a bill except on such testimony as would justify them as a traverse jury, to find the prisoner guilty. The reason of that principle of the law of evidence, that if a jury of trials entertain a doubt of the guilt of the party accused they ought to acquit him, is equally applicable to a Grand Jury."

We commend the above extracts from a "Treatise upon the Office and Duty of Grand Jurors," by Daniel Davis, Solicitor General of Massachusetts, to all persons who may think that Grand Jurors are registering machines to record the will of a Judge and Solicitor. We do not suppose any one will question the authority of this writer. Lawyers who know the weight to which his opinions are entitled will not do so. Those who never heard of him, and some of our legal luminaries, who greatly fear, never did hear of him, will keep quiet to hide their ignorance, if for no other reason.

Grand Jurors—Their Rights and Their Duties.
The great importance of this question has assumed in the estimation of the people of the Cape Fear, by reason of recent occurrences, renders unnecessary any apology for our frequent reference to the subject. A free press, free speech and free jury are as indispensable to the liberties of the people of the Cape Fear to-day, as they were a hundred years ago. Our ancestors knew their value then. If their descendants do not know their value now, it is not for the want of the teaching of history or for the lack of personal experience.

One hundred years ago the Lord Chief Justice of England sought to enforce the doctrine that Judge Russell seeks to fasten upon the country to-day. The same question that to-day comes to the lips of every thinking man was then asked, and with overwhelming forces. The great JUSTICE then asked: "Why force twelve honest men in palpable violation of their oaths, to pronounce their fellow subject a guilty man, when, almost at the same moment, they forbid them inquiring into the only circumstance which, in the eye of the law and reason, constitutes guilt, the malignity an innocence of his intentions?"

There was danger then; there is danger now. This is no new question, nor does it even come in a new form. We verily believe that in the shape of race and oppression, at least, there is nothing new under the sun. The same authority, from which we quoted on yesterday, says: "It is asserted in this note quoted in Bacon, that it is the doctrine of Lord Hale confirmed by *Pemberton, C. J.*, in the trial of Lord Shaftesbury, that as an indictment is merely an accusation and the party is afterwards to undergo a trial, the Grand Jury ought, UPON PROBABLE EVIDENCE ONLY, to find a bill. This doctrine is wholly inadmissible in any government when the protection of the innocent and the rights of the accused are among the first objects of the constitution and laws."

That bill? The Journal still lives! They rest from their labor. Judge Russell and Mr. Solicitor Cantwell have been in the pangs of a protracted labor during the past week, and, strange to say, for two such old ones, they have made a miscount that would reflect upon the accuracy of even the youngest political matron in the land. Keeping accounts is evidently not a specialty with those gentlemen. But the miscount in time was perhaps their most venial error. There was a sad mistake, too, somehow, in establishing the paternity of their expected offspring, which, taking time by the forelock, they had already named "Libel."

They tried to father the "Libel responsibility" on the Journal, but the trouble was to prove it. It was a serious thing. It was said that the Journal had pronounced one Hugh L. Bond, Judge of the United States Circuit Court, to be a

LOCAL.

THE WILMINGTON JOURNAL.
WILMINGTON, N. C.,
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1872.

GRAND JURIES—THEIR RIGHTS AND DUTIES.
There can be no institution designed to co-operate with the judicial powers in the detection and punishment of crimes more perfect than that of Grand Jurors. It is one of their most important duties, however, to protect the innocent against the groundless and malicious accusations which are so frequent in a Government where any person may obtain and pursue a public prosecution at the expense of the State.

"It was formerly held that the Grand Jury ought to find a bill if probable evidence were adduced to support it, because it is only an accusation; and the prisoner can defend himself on his trial. But this is an oppressive and dangerous position; and has since been denied and almost unrepented by the greatest sages of the law, who have deprecated the ignominy, dangers of perjury, the anxiety of delay, and the misery of a prisoner, that might be the consequence of an accusation that does not fully satisfy the Grand Jury of the guilt of the defendant. Accordingly, it has now become a settled principle that the Grand Jury cannot, consistently with their oath, find a bill except on such testimony as would justify them as a traverse jury, to find the prisoner guilty. The reason of that principle of the law of evidence, that if a jury of trials entertain a doubt of the guilt of the party accused they ought to acquit him, is equally applicable to a Grand Jury."

We commend the above extracts from a "Treatise upon the Office and Duty of Grand Jurors," by Daniel Davis, Solicitor General of Massachusetts, to all persons who may think that Grand Jurors are registering machines to record the will of a Judge and Solicitor. We do not suppose any one will question the authority of this writer. Lawyers who know the weight to which his opinions are entitled will not do so. Those who never heard of him, and some of our legal luminaries, who greatly fear, never did hear of him, will keep quiet to hide their ignorance, if for no other reason.

Grand Jurors—Their Rights and Their Duties.
The great importance of this question has assumed in the estimation of the people of the Cape Fear, by reason of recent occurrences, renders unnecessary any apology for our frequent reference to the subject. A free press, free speech and free jury are as indispensable to the liberties of the people of the Cape Fear to-day, as they were a hundred years ago. Our ancestors knew their value then. If their descendants do not know their value now, it is not for the want of the teaching of history or for the lack of personal experience.

One hundred years ago the Lord Chief Justice of England sought to enforce the doctrine that Judge Russell seeks to fasten upon the country to-day. The same question that to-day comes to the lips of every thinking man was then asked, and with overwhelming forces. The great JUSTICE then asked: "Why force twelve honest men in palpable violation of their oaths, to pronounce their fellow subject a guilty man, when, almost at the same moment, they forbid them inquiring into the only circumstance which, in the eye of the law and reason, constitutes guilt, the malignity an innocence of his intentions?"

There was danger then; there is danger now. This is no new question, nor does it even come in a new form. We verily believe that in the shape of race and oppression, at least, there is nothing new under the sun. The same authority, from which we quoted on yesterday, says: "It is asserted in this note quoted in Bacon, that it is the doctrine of Lord Hale confirmed by *Pemberton, C. J.*, in the trial of Lord Shaftesbury, that as an indictment is merely an accusation and the party is afterwards to undergo a trial, the Grand Jury ought, UPON PROBABLE EVIDENCE ONLY, to find a bill. This doctrine is wholly inadmissible in any government when the protection of the innocent and the rights of the accused are among the first objects of the constitution and laws."

That bill? The Journal still lives! They rest from their labor. Judge Russell and Mr. Solicitor Cantwell have been in the pangs of a protracted labor during the past week, and, strange to say, for two such old ones, they have made a miscount that would reflect upon the accuracy of even the youngest political matron in the land. Keeping accounts is evidently not a specialty with those gentlemen. But the miscount in time was perhaps their most venial error. There was a sad mistake, too, somehow, in establishing the paternity of their expected offspring, which, taking time by the forelock, they had already named "Libel."

They tried to father the "Libel responsibility" on the Journal, but the trouble was to prove it. It was a serious thing. It was said that the Journal had pronounced one Hugh L. Bond, Judge of the United States Circuit Court, to be a

LOCAL.

THE WILMINGTON JOURNAL.
WILMINGTON, N. C.,
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1872.

GRAND JURIES—THEIR RIGHTS AND DUTIES.
There can be no institution designed to co-operate with the judicial powers in the detection and punishment of crimes more perfect than that of Grand Jurors. It is one of their most important duties, however, to protect the innocent against the groundless and malicious accusations which are so frequent in a Government where any person may obtain and pursue a public prosecution at the expense of the State.

"It was formerly held that the Grand Jury ought to find a bill if probable evidence were adduced to support it, because it is only an accusation; and the prisoner can defend himself on his trial. But this is an oppressive and dangerous position; and has since been denied and almost unrepented by the greatest sages of the law, who have deprecated the ignominy, dangers of perjury, the anxiety of delay, and the misery of a prisoner, that might be the consequence of an accusation that does not fully satisfy the Grand Jury of the guilt of the defendant. Accordingly, it has now become a settled principle that the Grand Jury cannot, consistently with their oath, find a bill except on such testimony as would justify them as a traverse jury, to find the prisoner guilty. The reason of that principle of the law of evidence, that if a jury of trials entertain a doubt of the guilt of the party accused they ought to acquit him, is equally applicable to a Grand Jury."

We commend the above extracts from a "Treatise upon the Office and Duty of Grand Jurors," by Daniel Davis, Solicitor General of Massachusetts, to all persons who may think that Grand Jurors are registering machines to record the will of a Judge and Solicitor. We do not suppose any one will question the authority of this writer. Lawyers who know the weight to which his opinions are entitled will not do so. Those who never heard of him, and some of our legal luminaries, who greatly fear, never did hear of him, will keep quiet to hide their ignorance, if for no other reason.

Grand Jurors—Their Rights and Their Duties.
The great importance of this question has assumed in the estimation of the people of the Cape Fear, by reason of recent occurrences, renders unnecessary any apology for our frequent reference to the subject. A free press, free speech and free jury are as indispensable to the liberties of the people of the Cape Fear to-day, as they were a hundred years ago. Our ancestors knew their value then. If their descendants do not know their value now, it is not for the want of the teaching of history or for the lack of personal experience.

One hundred years ago the Lord Chief Justice of England sought to enforce the doctrine that Judge Russell seeks to fasten upon the country to-day. The same question that to-day comes to the lips of every thinking man was then asked, and with overwhelming forces. The great JUSTICE then asked: "Why force twelve honest men in palpable violation of their oaths, to pronounce their fellow subject a guilty man, when, almost at the same moment, they forbid them inquiring into the only circumstance which, in the eye of the law and reason, constitutes guilt, the malignity an innocence of his intentions?"

There was danger then; there is danger now. This is no new question, nor does it even come in a new form. We verily believe that in the shape of race and oppression, at least, there is nothing new under the sun. The same authority, from which we quoted on yesterday, says: "It is asserted in this note quoted in Bacon, that it is the doctrine of Lord Hale confirmed by *Pemberton, C. J.*, in the trial of Lord Shaftesbury, that as an indictment is merely an accusation and the party is afterwards to undergo a trial, the Grand Jury ought, UPON PROBABLE EVIDENCE ONLY, to find a bill. This doctrine is wholly inadmissible in any government when the protection of the innocent and the rights of the accused are among the first objects of the constitution and laws."

That bill? The Journal still lives! They rest from their labor. Judge Russell and Mr. Solicitor Cantwell have been in the pangs of a protracted labor during the past week, and, strange to say, for two such old ones, they have made a miscount that would reflect upon the accuracy of even the youngest political matron in the land. Keeping accounts is evidently not a specialty with those gentlemen. But the miscount in time was perhaps their most venial error. There was a sad mistake, too, somehow, in establishing the paternity of their expected offspring, which, taking time by the forelock, they had already named "Libel."

They tried to father the "Libel responsibility" on the Journal, but the trouble was to prove it. It was a serious thing. It was said that the Journal had pronounced one Hugh L. Bond, Judge of the United States Circuit Court, to be a

